

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Fig. 4B and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 4B.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. The Office Action objects to the drawings; objects to claim 2; rejects claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §101; rejects claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112; rejects claims 1-5 and 7-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102; and rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103. By this amendment, Figure 4b, the specification, and claims 2, 12 and 16-18 are amended. No new matter is added.

I. Objections to the Drawings.

A. The Office Action objected to figure 3A for not having a reference sign included in the description. "Detection ID" 32 in the paragraph beginning on page 20, line 24, has been amended to recite "detection ID" 22 to obviate this objection.

B. The Office Action objected to figure 4B for not having a reference sign included in the description. The former title "Object Detection Message" has been amended to recite "Object Non-Detection Message" in order to obviate the objection.

C. The Office Action objected to figure 5 for containing "common document folder 54," which is not referenced in the description. "The common document folder" 64 in the paragraph beginning on page 23, line 22, has been amended to recite "the common document folder" 54 in order to obviate this rejection.

II. Objection to the Claims

The Office Action objected to claim 2 for containing a typographical error. Claim 2 has been amended to recite "the activity" in order to obviate this objection.

III. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejected claims 16-18 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 16-18 have been amended to recite the program in such a manner that is executable and being claimed as structurally and functionally interconnected with a computer-

readable recording medium in order to establish the program as a computer component and realize its functionality.

Accordingly, claims 16-18 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected claims 12 and 18 as indefinite because they recited the limitation "the degree of relation" without sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 12 has been amended to recite the limitation "a degree of relation." Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's objection to claim 18, noting that claim 18 contains no such language referring to "the degree of relation."

Accordingly, claims 12 and 18 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5 and 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Toomey et al. (US 6,119,147; hereafter "Toomey."). Applicants traverse the rejection and amend claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-21.

Toomey relates to a method and system for computer-mediated, multi-modal, asynchronous meeting in a *virtual space* that provides for enabling, reviewing and augmenting meetings that take place in a *virtual environment* (emphasis added; column 1, lines 10 to 14). To the contrary, the claimed invention discloses that "user's activities are recorded in two work spaces  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  which are located at distant places from each other being connected by a network" (see page 16, lines 17 to 20). Toomey thus concerns meetings held in *virtual space*, whereas the claimed invention contemplates user activities conducted in *real (actual) spaces*. Moreover, in the claimed invention, if an object is non-human, such as a document, a user in work space  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$  triggers "an activity event conducted by the object," i.e.

“an event that a document content is accessed.” In other words, the claimed invention compiles an historical record of activities conducted in *real (actual) spaces*.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 recites “the work space including at least one real space,” and that “a real place for each object where each object conducts the detected activity event.” Amended claims 2, 11 and 13-21 also recite “the work space including at least one real space.” Therefore, it is clear that claims 1, 2, 11 and 13-21, including all claims depending therefrom, include events which are conducted in real (actual) spaces. This feature is nowhere disclosed in Toomey.

Thus, Applicant believes that the claimed invention is different from Toomey for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Toomey does not anticipate the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 is rejected as being unpatentable over Toomey in view of Weinberger et al. (US 6938258; hereafter "Weinberger".) The Office Action asserts that Toomey does not disclose a capture input means, however, Weinberger discloses video conferencing and data communication. Therefore, it would allegedly have been obvious for an ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the video camera in Weinberger with Toomey. Applicants traverse this rejection and amend claim 1 and 6.

As discussed above, Toomey is different from the claimed invention at least in that Toomey discloses events occurring in *virtual space*, whereas the claimed invention involves *real (actual) spaces*. Moreover, per amended claim 1, the claimed invention "*saves the activity event detected while relating the activity event detected to time for each object during which each object conducts the detected activity event and a real place for each object where each object conducts the detected activity event.*" In other words, the claimed invention compiles history data for objects in real spaces. The claimed invention is thus ideally suited

to applications involving, for example, several remote users wishing to access and modify non-conventional media, such as a document, at different times.

Weinberger does not remedy Toomey's deficiencies in this respect. Firstly, Weinberger is generally directed toward an airline passenger entertainment system, as opposed to the claimed workspace control apparatus. Weinberger is therefore not designed to, nor would the simple inclusion of Weinberger's video cameras on a network, allow users to compile history data for multiple objects in real (actual) places. Such functionality is clearly beyond the scope envisaged in Weinberger's disclosure.

Thus, there is no suggestion in Toomey to look toward Weinberger in order to achieve the attributes of the claimed invention because Weinberger is directed toward an airline passenger entertainment system that does not attempt to address the problems solved by the instant invention. Further, combining Toomey and Weinberger does not achieve a critical feature of the claimed invention, i.e., compiling historical data for multiple objects in real space.

For at least these reasons, Toomey in view of Weinberger would not have rendered obvious the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan C. Cady  
Registration No. 56,762

JAO:RCC/amw

Attachment:  
Replacement Sheet - Fig. 4B

Date: November 29, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--